

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Applicant appreciates the interview with Examiner Syed Ali on February 14, 2004 in which currently amended claims were discussed. No agreement was reached as to the claims during the interview.

CLAIMS

The Office Action dated 12/03/2003 rejected claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, and 20 and objected to claim 13. Claims 1-6, 9, 16, 17, 18, and 20 are amended by this amendment. Claims 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 19 are cancelled. No new claims are added. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 15-18, and 20 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent from itself. Claim 13 is cancelled by this amendment, and therefore the basis of the rejection is moot.

Claim Rejections**35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12, 15-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson (U.S. Patent 6,148,346 – hereinafter “Hanson”). Claim 1 is a system claim that has been amended to describe a workstation having a first computer, the first computer is in data communication with a second computer via a network, wherein the second computer is outside of the workstation and the second computer is controlled by a third party, ..., wherein a user interface displays diagnostic information on the first computer regarding the at least one printing device, and wherein the user

interface includes a share mechanism that, when actuated at the first computer, allows the remote diagnostic center to display the user interface on the second computer, and wherein the printing device settings of the first computer can be changed by input to the user interface at the second computer that are applied to the first computer.

Hanson shows a dynamic device driver that provides communication between various devices and various types of operating system across various types of network systems. The Examiner indicates that Hanson shows a diagnostic center (the host computer on column 4, lines 40-45, and column 4, lines 10-19). The Applicant submits that the host computer in Hanson describes providing an effective communication between separate computers. The Applicant submits that the host computer of Hanson is not to be confused with the claimed diagnostic center that, only when actuated at the first computer, allows the remote diagnostic center to display the user interface on the second computer, and wherein the printing device settings of the first computer can be changed by input to the user interface at the second computer that are applied to the first computer.

The Office Action indicates on page 12 that "Hansen teaches to obtain diagnostic data from the one or more printing device after receiving explicitly authorization to do so from a workstation, and wherein the diagnostic data is simultaneously viewable at the remote diagnostics center and at the workstation. The Applicant submits that the cited paragraph of Hanson (column 8, lines 44-65) describe a system administrator executing a diagnostic program on a printer to obtain the current status of the printer such as for toner level, paper jams. There is no suggestion of a share mechanism, or the like, that is actuated at the first computer that has the effect of displaying the user interface on the second computer. To maintain such a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 would require impermissible hindsight. The Applicant therefore submits that it is thereby improper to maintain the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hanson.

The Applicant submits that **claims 2-5** that depend from claim 1 are patentable over Hanson for at least these reasons. Applicant thereby respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of these claims.

5 **Claim 9** is a method claim that has been amended to include the language receiving authorization from a the first computer to view diagnostic data that is related to the printing device at the second computer, and transmitting printing device commands related to the printing device in response to the diagnostic data from the second computer device to the first
10 computer device, the authorization resulting from a user interface in the first computer; receiving and displaying the user interface that displays the diagnostic data at the second computer from a printing device of the first computer only if the explicit authorization to access printing device diagnostic data has been received; and simultaneously displaying the user interface that
15 displays diagnostic data at the first computer that has authorized access to the diagnostic data at the second computer.

The Examiner indicates that Hanson shows obtaining diagnostic data from one or more printing devices after receiving explicit authorization from workstation. The amended language of Claim 9 of the present application is
20 amended to describe simultaneously displaying the diagnostic data at the first computer that has authorized access to the diagnostic data and the second computer. The Applicant submits that Hanson does not suggest this type of user interface displaying at the second computer, or this type of command accepting from the second computer at the first computer. The Applicant
25 therefore submits that it is improper to maintain the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hanson.

The Applicant submits that claims 10, 12, and 15 that depend from claim 9 are patentable over Hanson for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of these claims.

30 **Claim 16** is a method claim that has been amended to recite granting explicit permission to the second computer from the first computer to view and

control the printer information management system to execute the diagnostic program to obtain diagnostic data from the one or more printers; and displaying a user interface including the diagnostic data at the first computer at the same time that the user interface including the diagnostic data is being displayed at the second computer.

The Examiner indicates that Hanson shows a granting explicit permission (the system is being used for a system administrator) to view and control the printer information management system, and thereupon displaying the user interface including diagnostic data at the first computer and the second computer at the same time. The Applicant submits that Hanson instead provides real time information regarding the operating status of the peripheral device (column 8, lines 51-52). The Applicant submits that Hanson does not suggest this type of user interface displaying at the second computer, or this type of command accepting involving the user interface from the second computer at the first computer. The Applicant therefore submits that it is improper to maintain the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hanson.

The Applicant submits that claims 17 and 20 that depend from claim 16 are patentable over Hanson for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 13, and 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson, and further in view of Wood et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,127 – hereinafter Wood et al.). Claim 1 (which claim 6 depends from) is a system claim that has been amended to recite wherein the user interface includes a share mechanism that, only when actuated at the first computer, allows the remote diagnostic center to display the user interface on the second computer, and wherein the printing device settings of the first computer can be changed by input to the user interface at the second computer that are applied to the first computer. As discussed above, the Applicant

submits that Hanson does not disclose such a user interface with a share mechanism. Wood et al. is not relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Hanson as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hanson and Wood et al. does not disclose or suggest the method of claim 6.

Method **claim 13** is cancelled by this Amendment.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Wood et al. Claim 16 (which claim 18 depends from) is a method claim that has been amended to recite displaying the diagnostic data at the first computer at the same time that the diagnostic data is being displayed at the second computer. As described above, Hanson does not show displaying the user interface including the diagnostic data at the first computer at the same time that the user interface including the diagnostic data is being displayed at the second computer. Wood et al. is not relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Hanson as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hanson and Wood et al. does not disclose or suggest the method of claims 16 or claim 18. As such, the Applicant submits that since claim 18 depends from claim 16, the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn and these claims allowed for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject matter application.

5

Respectfully Submitted,

10

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite
500
Spokane, WA 99201

Date: 4/2/04

15

By: Glenn B. Foster
Glenn B. Foster
Reg. No. 32,676